

CHAPTER IV.

THE TOWN OF RUMFORD.—FALLS WITHIN JURISDICTION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

1734–1742.

As before suggested, Henry Rolfe made petition to the general court of Massachusetts praying, “for himself and the grantees of the plantation of PennyCook” that “they might be heard to make it appear—that they” had “fulfilled the conditions of their grant, and that thereupon they” might “be allowed to bring in a bill to erect the plantation into a township.” Leave having been granted, the petitioners, on the 9th of February, 1734, brought in the following bill:

“An Act for erecting a new town within the county of Essex, at a plantation called PennyCook, by the name of Rumford.

“Whereas, the plantation of PennyCook, so called, of the contents of seven miles square and one hundred rods extending on the south bounds the full breadth of said plantation,—which has by this court formerly been and hereby is declared to lie in the county of Essex, is completely filled with inhabitants, who have built and finished a convenient meeting-house for the public worship of God, and some time since have settled a learned Orthodox minister among them; and have, to full satisfaction, complied with all the articles and conditions of their grant respecting their settlement; and thereupon have addressed this court to be erected into a separate and distinct township, and hold and enjoy equal powers and privileges with the other towns in the province:

“Be it enacted by His Excellency the Governor, and Council and Representatives, in General Court assembled, and by the authority of the same—That the plantation of PennyCook, in the county of Essex, as the same is hereafter bounded and described; be and hereby is constituted a separate and distinct township, by the name of RUMFORD; the bounds of said township being as follows, viz.: Beginning where Contoocook river falls into Merrimack river, and thence to extend upon a course east seventeen degrees north three miles, and upon a course west seventeen degrees south four miles, which is the northerly bounds of said township; and from other parts of that line, to be set off southerly at right angles until seven miles and one hundred rods shall be accomplished from the said northern bounds; and the inhabitants thereof be and hereby are vested and endowed with equal powers, privileges, and immunities that the inhabitants of any of the other towns within this province are or ought by law to be vested or endowed with.”

This bill was enacted into a law, on the 27th of February, 1734; and the act of incorporation was confirmed by King George the Second in 1737. But whence came the corporate name of the township is not known. "It is supposed," however, "to have been given from that of a parish in England from which some of the proprietors originated."¹

The anniversary March meeting of the plantation of Penacook, now at hand, was superseded by the first town-meeting of Rumford. By order of the general court, Benjamin Rolfe had notified the "freeholders and other inhabitants of the town of Rumford lawfully qualified to vote," to assemble at the meeting-house, on Monday, the 11th day of March, at "two of the clock in the afternoon—to choose" town officers, " . . . and to do . . . other things . . . thought proper for the interest of the inhabitants . . ."² At the meeting thus held, with Ebenezer Eastman as moderator, and Benjamin Rolfe as clerk, the list of officers of the preceding year was filled; "a school" was provided for "so far as the money" previously voted would go; and consent was given for opening a public highway, already laid out by the selectmen, extending from the bridge, southward through "the Eleven Lots and thence to the bend of the river." It was also "voted that the hogs in the town of Rumford be not allowed to go at large but be shut up in inclosures, for the year ensuing." The question whether swine should roam or be enclosed was for some years following annually decided in town-meeting.

But at this first meeting no money was raised for the "ministerial charge and the other charges of the town for" the year 1734; a special order of the general court being requisite to such action. Benjamin's Rolfe's notification of the meeting contained no mention of raising money, as, presumably, the court's order under which he acted contained none.² Here was a hitch in the transition from plantation to town, which was not removed till late in the year. In November Ebenezer Eastman and Henry Rolfe were "chosen to petition the General Court for an order . . . for raising money for defraying the ministerial charge and the other charges of the town for the year and during the court's pleasure."³ The movement seems to have been successful; for, at a town-meeting held on the 26th of December, 1734, "one hundred and ten pounds were raised . . . for defraying the ministerial and school charge and the other necessary charges of the town for the year current."

The transition from plantation to town having been effected,

¹ Bouton's Concord, 141; Annals of Concord, 15.

² Town Records, 6.

³ *Ibid.*, 11.

"The Proprietors of PennyCook," as they had hitherto been styled, became henceforth known as "The Proprietors of the common and undivided lands in the township of Rumford," and held their meetings and kept their records apart from those of the town; as, indeed, they had begun to do during the last year of the plantation. It was not till 1734 that John Wainwright delivered the proprietary records to Benjamin Rolfe who had succeeded him as clerk three years before. He did so after the proprietors had granted him one hundred acres of land in the township whose early settlement he had efficiently promoted, and after "the inhabitants and freeholders" had deputed their town clerk "to ask and receive of him the book of proceedings."¹

The town and proprietary organizations, each performing its appropriate functions, coöperated to promote the welfare of Rumford. In 1735 the town added to its official list a surveyor of flax and hemp, and sealer of weights and measures; the former office continuing for some years, the latter remaining permanent. The bounties on wolves and rattlesnakes were continued; as they were to be, with little, if any, interruption till 1749 if not longer. An educational appropriation was made so that "Deacon John Merrill and Mr. James Abbott, or either of them," might "hire a man to keep school, four months, the next winter and spring."² The records show similar provision to have been made for schooling in subsequent years. Thus in 1739 the school was ordered to "be kept" from October 20th to April 20th of the succeeding year; and in 1740, from October 15th to April 15th, 1741. At the March meeting of the year last mentioned the selectmen were instructed to hire a school-master for the year ensuing, and to order when and where the school "should be kept." Doubtless James Scales was teaching at this time. He had been received, in 1737, "to full communion" with the church in Rumford upon recommendation from the church in Boxford, and, in 1739, was given "liberty to build a pew in the one half of the hindermost seat at the west end of the meeting-house, that is, next the window."³

As hitherto and afterwards, highways within the town received attention, both as to the repair of existing ones, and the acceptance of those newly laid out by the selectmen. Of the latter was one—accepted in 1736—that led to Hale's Point, and was later to be known as Ferry road, or street. It seems that there was early a ferry at Hale's Point;⁴ for in 1739 a new highway is described as extending "from where they usually land the great boat coming from Sugar Ball, to the highway that leads to the old fort."⁵

¹ Town Records, 13.

² *Ibid.*, 21.

³ *Ibid.*, 47.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 27.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 50.

In 1735 provision was made to better the way leading outward to the country below, in that portion of it between Suncook and Chester, and an appropriation was made towards building a bridge over the Suncook river, at or near the old ferrying-place, where a Penacook boat had plied since 1729.¹ One third of the expense seems to have been borne by Rumford; another third, by the settlers of Suncook who had come in to occupy the grant of 1727; and the remainder, possibly, by Chester.² In a special Rumford town-meeting held on the 10th of December, 1735, the pay was fixed for the men to be employed in building the bridge, and a committee was appointed "to take care that the," work "be well done."³

The minister was remembered, in 1736, in a special appropriation of fifty pounds to enable him "to clear a pasture and bring it to English grass, that he" might "live more comfortable in his family upon the account of a dairy than" hitherto.⁴ The improvement of the meeting-house also came repeatedly in order. Thus, in 1736, Edward Abbott was "impowered to repair and fit up the seats, . . . make a door to the pulpit, and put up the windows"; and in 1738, Jeremiah Stickney and Benjamin Rolfe were ordered "to take care that galleries be built." In 1738, also, Benjamin Rolfe, James Scales, and John Chandler were made a committee "to fence in the burying-place, according to the best of their discretion, at the town's charge."

In November, 1739, from apprehension of Indian mischief a garrison was ordered to be "built around the Reverend Mr. Timothy Walker's dwelling-house, at the town's cost"; and Mr. Barachias Farnum, the miller on Turkey river, was granted five pounds "to enable him to build a flanker to defend his mills," provided he should "keep a garrison at his dwelling-house" in that vicinity—otherwise, the "town" might "convert the flanker to its own use."⁵

With these precautions against "savage men," measures were taken, in December of the same year, to enforce the statute "for the better preservation and increase of deer"—the mildest of wild animals. At a meeting held specially for the purpose, "two meet persons," Joseph Eastman and John Chandler, were chosen "to inform of all breaches of the act, and to take care that the violations thereof be duly prosecuted and punished."⁶ Subsequently, for some years, a similar provision was made.

Meanwhile, "the proprietors of the common and undivided lands in the township" were acting by themselves in meetings held in the Rumford meeting-house. In 1735 they gave liberty to John Chand-

¹ See note at close of chapter.

² History of Pembroke, 95.

³ Town Records, 23.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 25, 28.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 47.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 48, 49.

ler "to build a sawmill on Rattlesnake brook,"—the outlet of Long Pond,—and to have "a convenient yard for his logs and boards"; with the right "to flow the great pond"—these rights to be enjoyed for fifteen years. This privilege, was not, however, to be improved by Captain Chandler for a sawmill; but, a little later, Capt. Henry Lovejoy,¹ who, with Barachias Farnum, had erected mills on Turkey river, came into possession of the premises, and built thereon a grist-mill, and subsequently, a forge, or smelter, where bar iron was made from ore obtained at the bend of the river southeast of the main settlement in the vicinity of Merrill's ferry.² The proprietors also disposed of the common meadow of the town for the year. In 1736 they ordered the six-acre lots of interval to be newly measured, with new bounds, when necessary, and with new plans and a due record made. On the 14th of March, 1737, they selected Benjamin Rolfe, John Chandler, and Ebenezer Eastman, as a committee to lay out a division of the common and undivided land; the said division to be as large as the good land would "allow of, and to be laid out to each grantee or proprietor of Rumford, in one or more pieces, so as to make the lot or lots equal in quality or quantity." This "Eighty Acres Division,"³—as it was called,—though the lots varied, according to quality, from eighty to one hundred and fifty acres, or more, was completed between the 14th of March and the last day of December, 1737; and the report of the committee was accepted at "a meeting of the proprietors regularly assembled at the meeting-house in Rumford," on the second day of February, 1738, and, with accompanying plans, was ordered to be "entered in the proprietors book."

The usual town-meetings of those days—both the annual in March and the occasional ones—were held upon warrants issued by the selectmen to a constable, setting forth the time, place, and objects of meeting, and ordering him to notify accordingly, "the inhabitants and freeholders." By virtue of the warrant, the constable placed "a notification of said meeting with the cause thereof at the meeting-house door." In the case of a meeting for choice of a representative to the general assembly of Massachusetts, the selectmen's warrant required the constable "to notify the freeholders and the inhabitants" having "an estate of freehold in land within the province . . . of forty shillings per annum at the least, or other estate to the value of fifty pounds sterling, to assemble, . . . and elect," by a major vote, some "freeholder and resident of the town" "to represent them in the great or general court to be held for his Majesty's service at the Court House in Boston." The first of such meetings in Rumford,

¹ *Granite Monthly*, May, 1893.

² Above the Lower, or Concord Bridge; Bouton's Concord, 546.

³ See note at close of chapter; Bouton's Concord, 128.

held on the 19th of May, 1735, was presided over by a moderator; but the subsequent ones had not this officer; "the selectmen regulating" them "agreeably to law"—as the record stands.¹ At that first meeting, as also at those held in 1736, '37, '38, it was voted not to send a representative. It would seem that, in thus waiving the right of representation, the men of Rumford were satisfied with their custom of employing special agents to bring their special wants to the favorable attention of the legislature, without incurring the greater expense of a regular representative. So, while declining, in 1736, to choose a representative to the general court, they selected Henry Rolfe to appear there as an agent, and "to use proper means to get the county of Essex divided into two counties"—a division which they felt would much promote their convenience.

The provincial boundary question, long pending, was still a burning one. After 1730, when Jonathan Belcher acceded to the governorship of both provinces, and the death of Lieutenant-Governor Wentworth soon after occurred, the question became complicated with that of entirely separating New Hampshire from Massachusetts, by giving the former province a governor of its own. Many of the most influential political leaders in New Hampshire were earnestly bent upon accomplishing this purpose, and were also strenuously urgent for settling the boundary lines,—particularly the southern one,—hoping thus to ensure to the province not only fixed but enlarged limits. In this they carried with them the majority of the people, and, of course, of the assembly. On the contrary, the leading men of Massachusetts, with Governor Belcher himself and his friends in New Hampshire, including a majority of the council, "were averse to pressing the settlement of the line";² hoping for a permanent "union" of the provinces, which they knew not how to effect. "But the governor, as obliged by his instructions, frequently urged the settlement of the lines in his speeches."³ A fruitless conference of committees from both provinces was held at Newbury in 1731; after which a majority of the New Hampshire assembly "determined no longer to treat with Massachusetts; but to represent the matter to the King, and petition him to decide the controversy."³ In place of Henry Newman,—mentioned in a former chapter,—whose commission had expired, John Rindge, a wealthy merchant of Portsmouth, was appointed by the assembly as agent in England, and entrusted with the petition to his Majesty; but "the council, a majority of which was in the opposite interest, did neither concur in the appointment nor consent to the petition. Mr. Rindge, on his arrival in England," early in 1732, "petitioned the King in his own

¹ Town Records, 20, 30.

² Belknap, 228.

³ *Ibid.*, 229.

name, and in behalf of the representatives of New-Hampshire, to establish the boundaries of the province; but his private affairs requiring his return to America, he did, agreeably to his instructions, leave the business in the hands of Capt. John Thomlinson, merchant, of London; who was well known in New-Hampshire, where he had frequently been in the quality of sea-commander. He was a gentleman of great penetration, industry, and address; and having fully entered into the views of Belcher's opponents, prosecuted the affair of the line, with ardor and diligence; employing for his solicitor," the capable and untiring Ferdinando John Parris.¹ The two proved more than a match for the Massachusetts agents before the lords of trade, to whom the petition was referred. In 1733 Parris moved the question, "From what part of Merrimack river the line should begin?" In 1734 the attorney and solicitor-general, to whom the question was referred, after hearing counsel on both sides, expressed the opinion, "that according to the charter of William and Mary, the dividing line ought to be taken from three miles north of the Merrimack, where it runs into the sea." Copies of this opinion having been given to both parties, "the lords of trade reported, that the King should appoint commissioners from the neighboring provinces, to mark out the dividing line. This report was approved by the lords of council."² Twenty commissioners having accordingly been appointed "from among the councillors of New-York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Nova Scotia, of whom five were to be a quorum,"² eight of the appointees—three from Nova Scotia, and five from Rhode Island—met at Hampton on the 1st day of August, 1737, "published their commission," and "opened their court."² New Hampshire, by her committee of eight,—four of the council, and four of the assembly,—promptly delivered her claim and demand in the following words: "That the southern boundary of said province should begin at the end of three miles north from the middle of the channel of Merrimack river, where it runs into the Atlantic ocean; and thence should run on a straight line, west, up into the mainland (toward the South sea) until it meets his Majesty's other governments. And that the northern boundary of New-Hampshire should begin at the entrance of Pascataqua harbor, and so pass up the same, into the river of Newichwannock, and through the same, into the farthest head thereof; and thence north-westward, (that is, north, less than a quarter of a point, westwardly) as far as the British dominion extends; and also the western half of Isles of Shoals, we say, lies within the province of New-Hampshire."³

But Massachusetts was not ready to proceed, and the court ad-

¹ Belknap, 229.

² *Ibid.*, 239.

³ *Ibid.*, 242.

journed for a week, to give her time. The court met on the 8th of August, according to adjournment. The claim of Massachusetts was presented by her committee of eleven—five of the council, and six of the assembly; one of the latter being Henry Rolfe, of Newbury, so prominent among the proprietors of Penacook. The court having ordered copies of the respective claims of the two provinces to be drawn and exchanged, and having appointed as an additional clerk, Benjamin Rolfe, the capable son of Henry, and one of Rumford's most trusted citizens, adjourned till the 10th of August. The claim put in by Massachusetts was for "a boundary line, on the southerly side of New-Hampshire, beginning at the sea, three English miles north from the Black Rocks, so called, at the mouth of the river Merrimack, as it emptied itself into the sea sixty years ago; thence running parallel with the river, as far northward as the crotch or parting of the river; thence due north, as far as a certain tree, commonly known for more than seventy years past by the name of Endicott's tree, standing three miles northward of said crotch or parting of Merrimack river; and thence due west to the south sea." This was the line noted in a previous chapter and steadily insisted upon through many years. On the northerly (or easterly) side of New-Hampshire, was claimed a boundary line, "beginning at the entrance of Pascataqua harbor; passing up the same to the river Newichwanock; through that to the farthest head thereof, and thence a due northwest line, till one hundred and twenty miles from the mouth of Pascataqua harbor be finished."¹

When the commissioners came together on the tenth of the month, they had nine members in attendance; for Philip Livingston appeared from New York, and, "being senior in nomination, presided in the court." They also had the assemblies of both provinces near by, in accordance with the prorogation of the governor; that of New Hampshire meeting at Hampton Falls, and that of Massachusetts at Salisbury, five miles apart. The court then heard the case, which was closely and sharply contested. The points in debate were: Whether Merrimack river, at that time, emptied itself into the sea, at the same place where it did sixty years before; whether it bore the same name, from the sea up to the crotch; and whether it were possible to draw a parallel line, three miles northward of every part of a river, the course of which was, in some places, from north to south."² The controverted points in respect to the boundary line between New Hampshire and Maine, the latter then being a part of Massachusetts, were: "Whether it should run up the middle of the river, or on its north-eastern shore; and whether the line, from the head of the river,

¹ Belknap, 243.

² *Ibid.*, 245.

should be due northwest, or only a few degrees westward of north.”¹ The judgment of the commissioners as to the northern boundary line of Massachusetts, or in other words, the southern one of New Hampshire, was alternative and dependent upon the answer to the question, “Whether the charter of William and Mary granted to Massachusetts all the lands which were granted by the charter of Charles the First.” Since to this question they gave no answer, leaving that “to the wise consideration of His Most Sacred Majesty in his privy council,” their judgment settled nothing. It merely suggested that, with an affirmative answer to the question, the claim of Massachusetts should be affirmed: but that, with a negative answer, her claim should be denied; or rather, that the claim of New Hampshire should be sustained except as to the initial point of the westward running line, which, instead of being “three miles north from the middle of the channel of the Merrimack where it runs into the sea,” should be “three miles north from the southerly side of the Black Rocks,” situated three fourths of a mile farther north than the river’s mouth as claimed by New Hampshire.

As to the northern (or eastern) boundary between the provinces, the court determined “That the dividing line” should “pass through the mouth of Pascataqua harbor, and up the middle of the river Newichwannock, (part of which is now called Salmon Falls), . . . to the farthest head thereof, and thence north, two degrees westerly, until one hundred and twenty miles be finished from the mouth of Pascataqua harbor, or until it meets with His Majesty’s other governments; and that,” furthermore, “the dividing line” should “part the Isles of Shoals” between the provinces.

It is not desirable for present purposes, to pursue the obstinate contention which ensued in England over the evasive decree of the commissioners, and which, for more than two years, was carried on before the board of trade and the lords of council, by the agents of the two provinces—Thomlinson and Parris, for New Hampshire, and Quincy, Wilks, and Partridge, for Massachusetts. It must suffice here to record the final decree of King George the Second in council, determining the long and vexatious controversy. This was made on the 5th of March, 1740, and entirely ignored the much mooted question, “whether the new charter” of Massachusetts “granted all the lands comprehended in the old.” It was deemed equitable that the parallel line should extend at the distance of three miles north of the Merrimack as far as that river flowed from west to east, since, when the first grant was made, such was supposed to be its entire course. “But, as on the one hand, if by pursuing the

¹ Belknap, 245.

course of the river up into the country, it had been found to have a southern bend, it would have been inequitable to have contracted the Massachusetts grant; so, on the other hand, when it appeared to have a northern bend, it was equally inequitable to enlarge it.”¹ Therefore it was determined “That the northern boundary of the province of Massachusetts be a similar curve line, pursuing the course of Merrimack River, at three miles distance, on the north side thereof, beginning at the Atlantic ocean, and ending at a point due north of Pawtucket Falls; and a straight line drawn from thence due west, till it meets with His Majesty’s other governments.”¹

Having thus established the southern line without regard to the finding of the commissioners, the king affirmed their decree respecting the northern line. The royal determination as to the southern line gave to New Hampshire a tract of country, east of the Connecticut, “fourteen miles in breadth, and above fifty in length, more than” it “had ever claimed. It cut off from Massachusetts twenty-eight new townships between Merrimack and Connecticut rivers; besides large tracts of vacant land, which lay intermixed; and districts from six of” its “old towns on the north side of the Merrimack.”¹

Rumford, one of the townships cut off, was loyal to Massachusetts. It was but natural that its inhabitants should feel distrustful reluctance to fall within the untried jurisdiction of a province whose authorities had, in 1726, at the survey and allotment of Penacook lands, forbidden them the premises, and a year later had spread the township of Bow over the plantation itself, as an abiding, albeit as yet a latent, menace of evil. So, as early as the 11th of June, 1740, the disquieted “freeholders and inhabitants”—now, for the first time, exercising the right of choosing a representative to the general court—elected Benjamin Rolfe to serve in that capacity, and empowered him, in their name and behalf, “to prefer a petition to His Majesty, that they” might “be quieted in their possessions and remain under the jurisdiction of Massachusetts Bay.”² In Massachusetts, amid the disappointment and chagrin felt over the royal decree, it was resolved to relieve the heavy blow, if possible, by sending a new agent to England, “to petition the King that he would re-annex to the Massachusetts government the twenty-eight new townships which had been cut off, and the districts of the six old towns. It was also thought prudent that the whole province should not openly appear in the affair; but that petitions should be drawn by the inhabitants of these towns, and that the agent should be chosen by them.”³ Accordingly, at a town-meeting held in Rumford on the 26th of September, 1740, the inhabitants, being “in-

¹ Belknap, 257.

² Town Records, 55.

³ Belknap, 258.

formed that, by the determination of His Majesty in council respecting the controverted bounds between the province of Massachusetts Bay and New-Hampshire, they "were excluded from the province of the Massachusetts Bay to which they always supposed themselves to belong, unanimously voted that a petition be preferred to the King's Most Excellent Majesty setting forth" their "distressed estate, and praying that" they might "be annexed to the said Massachusetts province." "Thomas Hutchinson, Esq.," was "empowered to present the petition to His Majesty"—the same having been signed "in the name and behalf of the town" by "Benjamin Rolfe, Esq., Town Clerk." And it was also provided that if the said Hutchinson should "refuse the service or otherwise be prevented from the same," the said Rolfe might make choice of some other suitable person.¹ Thomas Hutchinson, afterwards governor of Massachusetts, went to England as agent, and there presented and urged the petitions; but finding "Thomlinson too hard an antagonist,"² he failed in his mission. For it was held "that it never could be for His Majesty's service to annex any part of his province of New-Hampshire, as an increase of territory to Massachusetts."²

It remained "to run out and mark the lines." This work was mostly done early in 1741, and *ex parte* by New Hampshire, for the Massachusetts assembly failed to join in appointing surveyors. "George Mitchell surveyed and marked the similar curve line, from the ocean, three miles north of Merrimack river, to a station north of Pawtucket Falls, in the township of Dracut."³ Richard Hazzen, a proprietor of Penacook, and the surveyor of its lands in 1726 and 1727, beginning at the Dracut station, marked the line thence westward, across the Connecticut river to the reputed eastern boundary line of New York, twenty miles east of the Hudson.

The return of the lines to the board of trade was one of Governor Belcher's last official acts; for the opposition which, from various motives, he had encountered during the boundary contention, at last proved too much for him. In 1741 he was removed from office, and was succeeded in Massachusetts by William Shirley, and in New Hampshire by Benning Wentworth, a son of the lieutenant-governor of a dozen years before. Thus the latter province secured what a majority of its people desired—its own governor, having no connection with Massachusetts.

Rumford, in population, and in all the resources and advantages of an intelligent, industrious, well-ordered, and consequently thriving settlement, was the most important town in the valley of the upper Merrimack. Not the least among its advantages were the services

¹ Town Records, 57-8.

² Belknap, 258.

³ *Ibid*, 259.

of its first regular physician, Dr. Ezra Carter, who came hither from South Hampton, in 1740, to contribute by skilful medical practice to the welfare of his own community and of the neighboring region, and by general ability and popular qualities to become prominent in the civil affairs of his chosen settlement.

Rumford had Canterbury on the east and northeast, an original New Hampshire township, then extending to the "crotch" of the river, and sparsely settled. It had on the north, Contoocook, granted by Massachusetts in 1732, and containing twenty-five families.¹ On the west lay New-Hopkinton, or Hopkinton, with a few settlers, —granted also by Massachusetts, in 1736, as "Number Five" in a line of townships extending from Rumford to Connecticut river, and somewhat overlapping the New Hampshire township of Bow, granted nine years before. Suncook lay along the south. Highways connected all the towns with Rumford, which was a center of dependence for certain wants of the new communities. Especially was this true of the first three. For the proprietors of Hopkinton contributed as early as 1737 twenty pounds for the opening of a highway to Rumford—a fact suggesting that Barachias Farnum's grist-mill was a convenient necessity. And later, in the Indian War, the prominent residents of Contoocook and Canterbury, with some of Rumford, petitioned the governor, council, and assembly of the province, setting forth that they were "greatly distressed for want of suitable grist-mills," and praying that soldiers might be provided to enable Henry Lovejoy to maintain his garrison which he had been compelled to abandon together with his mill on the outlet stream of Long pond, "at a place," as the petitioners averred, "most advantageously situated to accommodate the three towns."² Rumford had eminently prospered under the old jurisdiction, but was now inevitably coming under a new, and the better the grace with which it should do so, the better it might fare. Wisely declining, in 1741, to elect a representative to the assembly of the Bay province, or to grant money "to enable Thomas Hutchinson further to prosecute the affair" of annexation thereto,³ it became the next year a New Hampshire district instead of a Massachusetts town.

NOTES.

The Suncook Ford and Ferry. It is said in the History of Pembroke, pp. 94–95: "We think that . . . till the ferry-boat was used in 1729, the river Suncook was forded somewhere south of the present Osgood or Turnpike bridge; and that the ferry-boat was put

¹ Prov. Papers, Vol. V, 186.

² Bouton's Concord, 175–6.

³ Town Records, 3–4.

into the river in 1729, below the falls, in deeper water, where the banks are low, thus giving better opportunity to pass to and from the boat."

The "Eighty Acres" Division. The lots were laid off, sometimes, in different pieces, remote from each other. There were one hundred and seven of them. "Plans of them are preserved in the Proprietors' Records, Vol. III, with the roads and drift-ways reserved which ran through them." *Bouton's Concord (Proprietary Records), 128.*